



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/028,219 | 10/24/2001 | Krishnan V. Shankar | 31052.P003 | 2523 |
| 500 | 7590 | 10/24/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC | | | BLENMAN, AVALON | |
| 701 FIFTH AVE | | | ART UNIT | |
| SUITE 6300 | | | PAPER NUMBER | |
| SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092 | | | 2153 | |

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/028,219 | SHANKAR, KRISHNAN V. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Avalon Blenman | 2153 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8,10-14,33-39 and 51-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8,10-14,33-39 and 51-79 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/1/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is a second action in response to amendment and remarks filed August 1st, 2005. Claims 8, 10-14, 33-39, & 51-79 are presented for further consideration, of which 8, 12, 14, & 33 are independent claims. Claims 8, 12, & 14 have been amended. Claims 1-7, 9, 15-32, & 40-50 have been cancelled. Claims 51-79 have been added. This office action is made **FINAL**.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted by applicant on 08/01/2005 has been entered and is being considered by the examiner.

Response to Amendment

3. Examiner has accepted amendments to the specification, as such, the objection to the specification has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 53 recites the limitation "the server" (line5). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed and described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims **8, 10, 11, 33-39, 51-74** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rust (USPN 6,668, 273)**, hereafter referred to as Rust, in view of **Teng et al. (USPN 5,930,473)**, hereafter referred to as Teng, and further in view of **Rakavy et al. (USPN 5,913,040)**, hereafter referred to as Rakavy.

7. In considering independent claim **8**, Rust discloses in a server, a method of operation comprising:

- receiving information from the user (fig. 1, #110, Presenter Client") identifying one or more other users (fig. 1, #120, Attendee Clients) as a resource sharing partner with whom the user has chosen to share digital images, the multiple users including a first user who has identified a second user as a resource sharing partner [col. 7, lines 32-42]; and including
[It is obvious, that the first user must identify the second user as a resource sharing partner in this request (or prior to) in order for the control server to know to which second users to share the digital images.]
- the second user (Attendee) who has identified the first user (Presenter) as a resource sharing partner [col. 7, lines 11-14];

[By sending the identification code associated with a desired collaborative Web browsing session to the Control Sever, the Attendee client is inherently identifying the first user as a resources sharing partner.]

- receiving a first set of one or more digital uploaded by the first user (Presenter) [fig. 4, step 400, col. 10, lines 54-56]; and
- after receiving the first set of digital images from the first user (Presenter) providing a copy of the first set of digital images to the users identified as resource sharing partners (Attendee) of the first user by, for each of the identified users automatically downloading the one or more digital images of the first set in a transparent manner to a computing device associated with the identified user for display on that associated computing device [col. 10, line 54 – col. 11, line 1].

While Rust teaches all of these features, Rust does not explicitly disclose receiving a second set of one or more digital images uploaded by the second user. Nonetheless, in analogous art, of sharing digital images, Teng discloses a server (fig. 1, #12, video server) that receives and a set of digital images (video) uploaded by a first user (fig. 1, #14-I, "client") and a second user (fig. 1, #14-II, "client") (col. 6, lines 7-10). Teng further discloses:

- after receiving the second set of digital images from the second user, providing a copy of the second set of digital images to the users identified as resource sharing partners of the second user by for each of the identified users, automatically downloading the one or more digital images of the second set in a

transparent manner to a computing device associated with the identified user for display in association with at least one of a screen saver and a wallpaper on that associated computing device [“--the server 12 may retrieve stored video from a CD-ROM drive 16, via client 14-4 and then control broadcast of the stored video to other clients--”, col. 6, lines 15-17, 22-27].

Given the teachings of Teng, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system/method disclosed by Rust where a first set of digital images would be uploaded by a first user and additionally, a second set of digital images would be uploaded by a second user. The motivation as suggested by Teng would be to allow the mediation and distribution of digital images among all participating users [col. 6, lines 27-36].

While Rust in view of Teng teach automatically downloading one or more digital images of a first set and a second set for display on a computing device of an identified user, Rust does not explicitly disclose these digital images to be associated with a least one of a screen saver or wall paper. Nonetheless, in analogous art, Rakavy discloses digital images (advertisements) to be shared with one and more users of one and more corresponding remote computing devices (fig. 1, #500, local computer); receiving a indication (implied, fig 9. step 251) identifying said one and more users from among a community of users to receive one and more digital media resources; establishing a first data connection between said computing device and a server (fig. 1, communication

from advertiser); and transparently receiving (fig. 9. step 253) from said server (fig. 1, #600, network server) one and more digital media resources previously identified by any of said community of users as one and more digital media resources to be shared with a user associated with said computing device (col. 5, lines 32-36). Rakavy further discloses:

- automatically downloading one or more digital images (advertisements) to a computing device associated with an identified user for display in association with at least one of a screen saver and a wallpaper [col. 10, lines 52-62].

Given the teachings of Rakavy, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system/method disclosed by Rust in view of Teng, where the downloaded digital images would be associated with at least one of a screen saver or wall paper. The motivation as suggested by Rakavy would be so that the user of the computing device could customize their desktop with the digital media of their specific interest [col. 8, lines 9-13].

8. In considering claim **10**, Rust does not explicitly disclose digital images are each one and more frames of a digital video sequence. Nonetheless, Rakavy discloses:

- said one and more digital images (advertisements) are each one and more frames of digital video sequence [col. 3, lines 39-41, col. 8, lines 63-66].

9. In considering to claim **11**, Rust discloses:

Art Unit: 2153

- temporarily storing (Temp.Data file) the one and more digital images of the first set [fig. 4, step 430];
- receiving a data connection request (implied) from a computing device associated with the second users [col. 7, lines 9-19];
- authenticating the identity of the second user [col. 7, lines 9-19]; and
- using the requested data connection for the automatic downloading of the one and more digital images of the first set to the computing device associated with the second user [fig. 5, steps 510-520, col. 11, lines 1-13].

10. In considering claims **33-39**, the rejection is as set forth in previous office action mailed 04/01/2005.

11. In considering claim **51**, Rust implicitly discloses:

- deleting the temporarily stored one or more digital images of the first set if the second user is a last of the identified resource sharing partners of the first user to receive the one or more digital images of the first set [fig. 4, step 430, col. 10, line 54 –col. 11, line 1].

12. In considering claim **52**, Rakavy discloses:

- deleting the temporarily stored one or more digital images of the first set after a predetermined period of time has expired despite at least one of the multiple

users having not received the one or more digital images of the first set [col. 9, lines 16-27].

13. In considering claim **53**, Rust implicitly discloses:

- temporarily storing the one or more digital images of the first set (fig. 4, step 430) such that the automatic downloading of the one or more digital images of the first set for at least one of the identified users (Attendee) is performed while the first user (Presenter) is not connected to the server [col. 10, line 54 – col. 11, line 1].
[It is obvious that once the first set of digital images are uploaded to the server, the first user no longer has to be connected to the server since the second user downloads the digital images from the server via the Temp.Data file.]

14. In considering claim **54**, Rust discloses:

- performing the downloading in the background for the computing device while the identified user performs other tasks on the computing device [col. 7, lines 33-53].

15. In considering claim **55**, Rust discloses

- performing the downloading without explicit approval of the identified user [fig. 5, step 520, col. 11, lines 1-13].

16. In considering claim **56 & 58**, Rakavy discloses:

Art Unit: 2153

- receiving a rating for one of the digital images of the first set from each of one or more of the at least some users [col. 12, lines 60-65].
- receiving feedback from each of one or more of the at least some users [col. 12, lines 60-65].

Rakavy does not explicitly disclose providing the received rating or feedback to the resource sharing users. Nonetheless, Rust discloses a whiteboarding between resource sharing users [col. 7, lines 39-42]. Examiner takes official notice that at the time of the invention, it was well known in the art that whiteboarding provided comments (i.e. rating or feedback) to other users of the collaboration session.

17. In considering claim **57**, while Rakavy discloses receiving ratings for the digital images of the first set, Rakavy does not explicitly disclose generating an average rating for the digital images. Nonetheless, the average would have been an obviously derivation from the rating as this is a simple mathematical calculation. Further more, as set forth above in reference to claim 56 by Rust, the generated average could then be provided to other users via whiteboarding [col. 7, lines 39-42].

18. In considering claim **59**, Rakavy discloses:

- the images downloaded to the computing device associated with that user are for display by a screen saver on that computing device [col. 10, lines 52-62].

Art Unit: 2153

19. In considering claim **60**, Rakavy discloses:

- the images downloaded to the computing device associated with that user are for display as a wallpaper on that computing device [col. 10, lines 52-62].

20. In considering claim **61**, Rust discloses:

- the computing device associated with that user is a palmtop computer ("any suitable computer") [col. 5, lines 47-51].

21. In considering claim **62**, Rust discloses:

- the computing device associated with that user is a PDA ("any suitable computer") [col. 5, lines 47-51].

22. In considering claim **63**, Rust discloses:

- the computing device associated with that user is a portable device ("laptop") [col. 5, lines 47-51]

23. In considering claim **64**, Rust implicitly discloses:

- the images downloaded to the computing device associated with that user are further for one or more of editing by that user and organizing by that user (*editing is an well known feature of whiteboarding*) [col. 7, lines 32-42].

24. In considering claim **65**, Rust implicitly discloses:

- under control of the computing device associated with that user, performing editing and organizing of the images that are downloaded to the computing device in response to instructions from the user (*editing is an well known feature of whiteboarding*) [col. 7, lines 32-42].

25. In considering claim **66**, Rust implicitly discloses:

- editing of the images downloaded to the computing device associated with that user include augmentating those images in response to instructions from the user (*editing/augmenting is an well known feature of whiteboarding*) [col. 7, lines 32-42].

26. In considering claim **67**, while downloading images to the computing device associated with the user, Rust does not explicitly disclose organizing the images downloaded to the computing device. Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that organizing and designating folders/albums is a well-known common feature among many image viewing software programs. Furthermore, given the metadata information indicating the uploader (originator) and downloader (recipient), organizing the images according to these parameters would have been an obvious sorting feature.

27. In considering claim **69**, Rust discloses:

- under control of the computing device associated with that user, providing messaging capabilities (“chat window”) to enable the user to communicate with another user [col. 7, lines 32-41].

28. In considering claim **70**, Rust discloses:

- under control of the computing device associated with that user, communicating with the user who provided an image downloaded to that computing device while the downloaded image is displayed on that computing device (“whiteboard”) [col. 7, lines 32-41].

29. In considering claim **71**, Rust discloses:

- the communicating with the user who provided the downloaded image to that computing device is further performed while that image is concurrently displayed to that user on the computing device associated with that user (“whiteboard”) [col. 7, lines 32-41].

30. In considering claim **72**, Rust discloses:

- the communicating with the user who provided the downloaded image to that computing device includes exchanging text messages (“chat window”) [col. 7, lines 32-41].

31. In considering claim **73**, Rust discloses:

Art Unit: 2153

- the communicating with the user who provided the downloaded image to that computing device includes exchanging messages with audio content (“whiteboard”) [col. 7, lines 32-41].

32. In considering claim **74**, Rust discloses:

- the communicating with the user who provided the downloaded image to that computing device includes exchanging messages with video content (“whiteboard”) [col. 7, lines 32-41].

33. Claims **12-14, 75-77, & 79** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rust**, in view of **Teng**, in view of **Rakavy**, and further in view of **Ikeda**.

34. In considering to independent claim **12**, Rust discloses in a server, a method of operation comprising:

- receiving information from a first user identifying a second user as a resource sharing partner [fig. 4, step 430];
- receiving intonation from the second user identifying the first user as a resource sharing partner [col. 7, lines 9-19];
- receiving one or more digital media resources uploaded by at least one of said first and second users [col. 7, lines 9-19]

- relaying the one or more digital media resources to the second user if the one or more digital media resources were uploaded by the first user [fig. 5, step 520, col. 11, lines 1-13]

Rakavy discloses:

- generating at least one meta-data file (fig. 5, #51, "advertisement information record") to describe at least a subset of the one and more digital media resources [col. 7, lines 13-29].
- storing the at least one meta-data file in association with the one and more digital media resources described [fig. 5, col. 7, lines 13-29];

Teng discloses:

- relaying ("playback") the one or more digital media resources (video) to the first user (fig. 1, #14-*i*) if the one or more digital media resources were uploaded by the second user (fig. 1, #14-*i*) [col. 6, lines 22-27].

While Rust in view of Teng and Rakavy disclose a metadata file associated with a digital media resource, Rust in view of Rakavy do not explicitly disclose a metadata file indicating resource sharing partners who uploaded the digital media resource.

Nonetheless, in analogous art, Ikeda discloses a method of sharing digital media (images) via a mail server (claim 1). Ikeda further discloses:

- generated meta-data files ("transmission data") including one or more indications of resource sharing partner users who uploaded the digital media resources [fig. 35, ¶0040].

Given the teachings of Ikeda, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system/method disclosed by Rust in view of Teng and Rakavy where the metadata file associated with the digital media resource would also indicate the resource sharing partner that uploaded the media. The motivation, as suggested by Ikeda, would be for tracking purposes [0026]

35. In considering to claim 13, Rust further discloses:

- said one and more digital media resources are stored on said server (control server) in a compressed form (gif format) [col. 10, lines 38-43].

36. In considering to independent claim 14, Rust discloses in a server, a method of operation comprising:

- receiving information from a first user identifying a second user as a resource sharing partner [col. 7, lines 32-34];
- receiving intonation from the second user identifying the first user as a resource sharing partner [col. 7, lines 11-14];
- receiving one or more digital media resources uploaded by at least one of said first and second users [fig. 4, step 400, col. 10, lines 54-56].

Art Unit: 2153

- sending the one or more digital media resources to the second user if the one or more digital media resources were uploaded by the first user [fig. 5, step 520, col. 11, lines 1-13].
- receiving a request (col. 7, lines 32-36) from one of said first and second users (presenter) requesting that a copy of a digital media resource (visual data) be shared with a third user (2nd attendee to join session, col. 6, lines 8-12, col. 7, lines 9-10), said digital media resource having been previously uploaded to said server by said requesting one of said first and second users (presenter), shared with the other of said first and second users, (1st attendee) (implied in an existing session) and thereafter removed from both said server (implied, by Temp.Data file) and said computing device as associated with said requesting one of said first and second users (presenter) [col. 8, lines 48-54];

Teng discloses:

- sending ("play back") the one or more digital media resources (video) to the first user (fig. 1, #14i) if the one or more digital media resources were uploaded by the second user, and [col. 6, lines 22-27].
- requesting said previous copy of said digital media resource from said identified user for forwarding to said third user [col. 6, lines 22-27].

Ikeda discloses:

- for each of the one or more digital media resources, tracking the user who uploaded the digital media resource (sender address) and tracking the users to whom the digital media resources is sent (receiver address) [fig. 5, ¶0040];
- identifying at least one of each user to have received a digital media resource (receiver address) based at least in part on the tracking [fig. 5, ¶0040].

37. In considering claim **75**, Rakavy discloses:

- generating a distinct meta-data file for each of the one or more received digital media resources[col. 7, lines 13-29].

38. In considering claim **76**, Ikeda discloses:

- each generated meta-data file for a received digital media resource included one or more indications of who uploaded that resource , and using the generated meta-data files to identify digital media resources uploaded by an indicated user [fig. 35, ¶0040].

39. In considering claim **77**, Ikeda discloses:

- each generated meta-data file for a received digital media resource included one or more indications of who downloaded that resource, and using the generated meta-data files to identify digital media resources downloaded to an indicated user [fig. 35, ¶0040].

Art Unit: 2153

40. In considering claim **79**, Ikeda implicitly discloses:

- updating a stored meta-data file associated with the digital media resource to reflect the sending, and wherein the identifying of the at least one user to have received a previous copy of the digital media resource to be shared with the third user is based at least in part on the stored meta-data file for that digital media resource [fig. 35, ¶0040, ¶0048].

41. Claim **78** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rust** in view of **Teng**, in view of **Rakavy**, in view of **Ikeda** as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of **Novaes**. (USPN 2003/0005053).

42. In considering claim **78**, while Ruse in view of Rakavy disclose metadata files associated with each digital media resource, Rust in view of Rakavy do not explicitly disclose using the generated metadata to identify search results matching a indicated search criteria. Nonetheless, in analogous are of sharing digital media resources among multiple users (abstract) Novaes discloses

- without uncompressing the stored digital media resource files, using the generated meta-data files to identify digital media resources as being search results that match indicated search criteria [¶0005, ¶0002, ¶0003].

Given the teachings of Novaes at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system/method disclosed by Rust

Art Unit: 2153

in view of Teng, Rakavy, and Ikeda to use the metadata files to identify digital media search results that match indicated search criteria. The motivation, as suggested by Novaes, would be to allow the user to search metadata to organize the digital media [abstract]. For example, the user may want to categorize the images into different albums.

Response to Arguments

43. Applicant's arguments filed August 1st, 2005 with respect to claims 12 & 14 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

44. Applicants present the following arguments:

- (a) In considering amended claims **8, 12, 14, & 33**, Applicant's argues (pg. 15) Rust fails to teach or suggest users designating each other as resource sharing partners.
- (b) In considering amended claims **8, 12, 14, & 33**, Applicant argues (pg. 15) Rust fails to teach or suggest both users automatically exchanging digital media resources that they upload.
- (c) Applicant further argues that Teng describes a system in which "clients lack the ability to send upstream communications", in reference to col. 4, lines 54-58.

Art Unit: 2153

45. Regarding arguments set forth in 47(a) above, Examiner disagrees, Rust does indeed teach designating resource sharing partners as set forth above in reference to claim 8 [col. 7, lines 32-42].

46. Regarding arguments set forth in 47(b) above, Examiner agrees, Rust does not explicitly teach, automatically downloading data to a first user that was uploaded by a second user. Nonetheless, this feature is indeed taught in the primary reference by Teng as set forth above in reference to claim 8 [col. 6, lines 15-17, 22-27]. Examiner agrees that Teng does not suggest designating other users as resource sharing partners, nonetheless, as set forth above in reference to claim 8, this feature is already taught by Rust [col. 7, lines 32-42]

47. Regarding arguments set forth in 47(c) above, Examiner disagrees; this statement is taken out of context. Teng only suggests a multicast directory would be particularly useful for clients with no upstream communication. It is clear from col. 6, lines 22-27, that the clients do in fact upload digital images to a server.

Conclusion

48. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2153

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

49. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

50. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Avalon Blenman whose telephone number is (571) 272-


Art Unit: 2153

5864. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM (even date Mons. off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Avalon Blenman
Art Unit 2153
10/05/2005



JASON CARDONE
SPE AU 2145